1 2 3 4 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 5 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 6 7 DAMIEN DWAYNE OLIVE, No. C 09-4141 JSW (PR) 8 ORDER OF DISMISSAL Plaintiff, 9 VS. 10 KEN WONG, PA III, and SANDRA (Docket No. 2) KELLY, PA I, 11 Defendants. 12 13 14 15 Plaintiff, a prisoner of the State of California currently incarcerated at San Quentin State Prison in San Quentin, California, has filed a pro se civil rights 16 complaint under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 regarding statements made to him by his parole 17 officer which he contends reflect her homophobic attitude. The Court now reviews the 18 complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915A and dismisses it for failure to state a 19 20 cognizable claim for relief. Plaintiff's motion seeking to proceed in forma pauperis is GRANTED in another order filed simultaneously (docket no. 2). 21 **DISCUSSION** 22 23 In the complaint, Plaintiff complains that during a Board of Prison Hearings proceeding, Parole Officer Sandra Kelly made certain statements about Plaintiff's 24 25 sexuality and marital status which Plaintiff contends reflects her disagreement with his sexual preference and her homophobia. Plaintiff seeks injunctive relief. 26 A. Standard of Review 27

Federal courts must engage in a preliminary screening of cases in which

28

prisoners seek redress from a governmental entity or officer or employee of a governmental entity. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(a). In its review the court must identify any cognizable claims, and dismiss any claims which are frivolous, malicious, fail to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, or seek monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief. *See id.* at 1915A(b)(1),(2). Pro se pleadings must be liberally construed. *See Balistreri v. Pacifica Police Dep't*, 901 F.2d 696, 699 (9th Cir. 1990).

To state a claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, a plaintiff must allege two essential elements: (1) that a violation of a right secured by the Constitution or laws of the United States was violated, and (2) that the alleged deprivation was committed by a person acting under the color of state law. *See West v. Atkins*, 487 U.S. 42, 48 (1988).

In this case, Plaintiff fails to set forth allegations against the named Defendants that state a claim for relief. Plaintiff complains that his parole agent commented on his sexual orientation and the fact that he is married to another parolee and that her statements that he is not allowed to have contact with another individual on parole reflect a homophobic attitude toward Plaintiff. However, the conduct on the part of Defendants set forth here does not constitute a cognizable claim. Therefore, Plaintiff's claims are DISMISSED for failure to state a claim for relief.

CONCLUSION

For the forgoing reasons, Plaintiff's complaint is hereby DISMISSED for the reasons set forth above. The Clerk shall close the file and enter judgment in this case.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: April 16, 2010

JEFFREY S. WHITE United States District Judge

Afrey SWhite

27 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1	FOR THE		
2	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
3			
4			
5	DAMIEN D OLIVE,	Case Number: CV09-04141 JSW	
6	Plaintiff,	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	
7	v.		
8	KEN WONG et al,		
9	Defendant.		
10			
11	I, the undersigned, hereby certify that I am an employee in the Office of the Clerk, U.S. Distriction, Northern District of California. That on April 16, 2010, I SERVED a true and correct copy(ies) of the attached, by placing sain		
12			
13	copy(ies) in a postage paid envelope addressed to the person(s) hereinafter listed, by depositing said envelope in the U.S. Mail, or by placing said copy(ies) into an inter-office delivery		
14		receptacle located in the Clerk's office.	
15			
16	Damien Dwayne Olive T47433 San Quentin State Prison		
17			
18	San Quentin, CA 94974	Genniger Ottolini	
19	Dated: April 16, 2010	Richard W. Wieking, Clerk	
20	By: Jennifer Ottolini, Deputy Clerk		
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28		3	